

59. (Previously presented) A method of operating a wireless communication device, the method comprising:

receiving a message at the wireless communication device;

automatically detecting a contact identifier in the message;

automatically identifying a class of contact identifier to which the contact identifier belongs, from a plurality of predetermined classes of contact identifiers;

outputting descriptive information relating to the contact identifier on an output component of the wireless communication device; and

enabling a user of the wireless communication device to initiate a task relating to the contact identifier in response to said descriptive information being output, **including provisioning a user interface of the wireless communication device to perform the task according to the identified class of contact identifier.** (Emphasis added.)

Neither Laflin nor Helferich discloses or suggests enabling a user of the wireless communication device to initiate a task relating to the contact identifier in response to said descriptive information being output, including provisioning a user interface of the wireless communication device to perform the task according to the identified class of contact identifier in the received message. For example, with Applicants' invention, if the contact identifier is determined to be an email address, a softkey displayed on the communication device may be configured in response to the message to cause an email application to be initialized when pressed; whereas, if the contact identifier is determined to be a telephone number, that same softkey may instead be configured to cause an outgoing telephone call to be initiated. See, e.g., Specification, p. 15, lines 1-23; Figs. 2D-2F.

In the Office Action, the Office admits that Laflin fails to disclose the above-emphasized claim feature. However, the Office contends that Detlef discloses that feature at col. 5, lines 15-25 (Office Action, p. 2-3).

The Office is mistaken. Detlef generally discloses a system by which a thin client device 12 can provide a voice response to an email message. The section in Detlef cited by the Office (col. 5, lines 15-25) discloses that the device 12 receives an email message and "includes some form of command mechanism, such as a key or voice command, to generate a reply to the display EMail message." However, there is absolutely no disclosure or hint there of provisioning the user interface of the device 12 to generate the reply (or to do any other task). The fact that the device 12 has a command mechanism to generate a reply does not imply that any provisioning of the user interface occurs or is even necessary in response to the Email. It is noteworthy that the only place where Detlef even mentions "provisioning" is in col. 5, line 42, and that reference has nothing to do with how the client device 12 responds to a received message. Furthermore, there certainly is no disclosure or hint in Detlef of provisioning the user interface of the device according to an identified class of contact identifier (from a plurality of predetermined classes of contact identifiers) in the received message, as required by claim 59. Moreover, no suggestion of such functionality is found anywhere else in Detlef or in any of the other cited references, either individually or in combination.

Therefore, the combination of Laflin and Detlef fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 59. Accordingly, claim 59 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over the cited art.

Independent claims 112 and 128 also essentially include the feature discussed above and, therefore, are also patentable over the cited art for similar reasons. Due to

the above-noted deficiency of the combination of Laflin and Detlef, the remaining rejections (all of which rely at least partly on Laflin/Detlef) have also been overcome.

If the Office considers asserting yet another rejection under § 103 based on a different combination of references, Applicants again remind the Examiner that there must be something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability of making the alleged combination. In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Furthermore, such suggestion may not be found using hindsight gleaned from the applicant's specification. Id. at 1358. "[I]t is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or 'template' to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious." In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266 (1992).

Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Jordan M. Becker at (408) 720-8300.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 8/30/04



Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 26529
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300